

**Mission Bay Landfill
Technical Advisory Committee
City Administration Building
12th Floor Conference Room B
December 9, 2005
10:00am to 12:00pm**

Meeting Minutes

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye
Judy Swink

Rebecca Lafreniere
Robert Curtis

Barry Pulver
Brian McDaniel
George Murphy

TAC Members Absent

Bruce Reznik
Ben Leaf

Robert Tukey Ph.D.
Jeffry Gordon, MD

David Kennedy, DDS
John Wilks
David Huntley Ph.D.

Interested Parties/Alternates

Scott Andrews
Patrick Owen
Tessa McRae

Kathleen Blavatt
Beth Murray
Corrine Brindley

Mary Ann Kempczenski
Wayne William

Staff

Chris Gonaver

Ray Purtee

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made. A quorum was not present.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes were not approved because a quorum was not present.

Public Comment

Scott Andrews handed out EPA documents on the landfill's scoring and site assessment. Initially the site score was 61. The EPA used City and Woodward Clyde info to score the site. Scott said the City told the EPA that there were only municipal wastes there. EPA hired Bechtel who rescored the site all the way down to 14. Chris Gonaver responded that City staff will locate pertinent docs concerning EPA scoring and post them on the website.

Site Assessment Report

Councilmember Frye summarized where we are in the report review process – the goal is to try and finalize comments that will go to Tessa McRae of SCS by the end of this month.

Chris Gonaver went over the comment review process. After all comments are gathered they will be compiled and put together with their responses. If practical, similar comments will be grouped into categories such as “Potential Further Studies” or “Comment noted see page 2, paragraph 3” while others will require an individually crafted response by SCS. Prior to the February TAC meeting we plan to annotate the comments and distribute them. The goal is finalizing the document for presentation to the regulatory agencies.

Tessa McRae passed out a draft executive summary of the Site Assessment Report and said the executive summary is a work in progress and doesn't reflect responses to comments.

Barry Pulver asked Tessa McRae “how long do you need to respond to comments?” Tessa replied it should be possible within a month.

Scott Andrews felt that with the holidays coming and the executive summary just being handed out, there wasn't time to have all responses by December 31. Councilmember Frye responded that the goal is to have as many people comment who can, and how much time do you need? Is till the end of January O.K.? Then since SCS needs a month to prepare responses, response to comments would be distributed in March.

Councilmember Frye said that since we want to give everyone a chance to comment, we could even find ourselves at this time next year with the report finally in a format ready to go to regulatory agencies.

Scott said he will make every attempt to have his scientists review and respond by the end of January. Councilmember Frye responded if you need more time let us know, but since we have had the document since August 31, there has been a reasonable time.

Comments to the draft site assessment report were reviewed, specifically, the re-sequencing suggested by Judy Swink. Tessa responded that she's fine with some of the changes, but still wants Section 2 *Site Assessment Report Components* before section 4 *Fieldwork*. New section 4 *Site Assessment Report Components* is too far into the document. The new site conceptual model includes revisions to the preliminary site conceptual model. That's why it's old section 7, it was revised based on what was found in this assessment.

Barry Pulver felt it can stay nearer the end of the document, say section 7, as long as there's a reference made to the preliminary site conceptual model, telling the reader that it was modified based on field data.

Judy Swink described her re-numbering as that of a lay-person trying to make sense [of the progression] of the document. Councilmember Frye said the intent is to have a background, then history, then move into the new data.

Tessa McRae summarized the discussion on the re-sequencing by asking that the major change is moving *Historical Review* from section 5 to section 3? Judy said yes, that's what she was after as the old "5" becomes the new "3". Old "3" becomes new "4;" old "4" becomes "5". Old "6" stays as "6". Seven stays as 7, and so on.

Public Comment

Judy Swink discussed the South Shores excerpt that she prepared from the Mission Bay Park Master Plan(MBPMP) and the Mission Bay Park Natural Resources Management Plan, and the correction that was emailed out. Councilmember Frye thanked her for her time and efforts extracting this data from these plans.

Beth Murray had three CD's of the MBPMP and Natural Resources Report. Contact Beth if you want a copy of this CD. BMurray@sandiego.gov

Councilmember Frye asked if there were any technical discussion items that anyone wanted to bring up?

Wayne Williams was concerned that the thin cover area in the east of the site identified by SCS could use dirt right away. If it waited a year for the report to be finalized, this area could go thru two rainy seasons.

Ray Purtee said that Environmental Services has the wherewithal to add cover to this area and can begin a process to do so. An Environmental Services staff biologist would start the process with a reconnoiter of the area. Once all approvals have been received, dirt can be trucked in and placed to thicken the cover. Tessa said the area of this thinner cover is delineated in the report's figures (Fig 6.2). Judy said she felt the area would not impact park uses and that it was a good idea to start this simultaneously with finalizing the report. Ray agreed to send out an email announcing when the biologist will go out so anyone in the group can attend as a "field trip."

Brian McDaniel reminded the group that this landfill's Waste Discharge Requirement 97-11, requires noticing of the RWQCB before construction work can begin. Ray acknowledged that, and said it's part of the "process" ESD will have to follow. Councilmember Frye would like the ESD biologist to attend the January TAC meeting to discuss his/her findings and give Tessa McRae the meeting "off."

A question was asked "could Melanie Johnson, the City staff person who requested the ice plant removal, attend the field trip?" Ray Purtee replied that she will be notified and included in this project.

Pat Owen of Sea World requested that the TAC give approval for their parking lot expansion to proceed as the draft site assessment report doesn't show any problems. The Coastal Commission

is looking for a letter from this group approving the project. Pat would need such a letter by the February Coastal Commission hearing in order to get the lot paved by summer. Councilmember Frye said then we must have a January meeting where a quorum is present to vote on this and it must be sufficiently noticed. Was this put before the Mission Bay Park Committee (MBPC)? Answer was yes, though it may have been over a year ago.

Another project being held up is the promenade sidewalk. Sea World could start it right away after Coastal Commission approval.

Pat Owen will give Judy Swink a couple paragraphs about the parking lot expansion and promenade for the MBPC.

Councilmember Frye cautioned Pat that any letter the TAC finally approves may not read like he expects it to? Pat acknowledged this.

A concern was expressed that since additional groundwater samples have not been taken and landfill boundaries are not defined, it may be too soon to address this. Councilmember Frye responded that's why we must clearly notice this action beforehand.

It was pointed out that Monday January 16, is MLF holiday so would we get a quorum on the Friday before hand?

Councilmember Frye: Therefore the agenda for January shall include the biologist's talk about the field trip, and the promenade and parking lot expansion. Concerning the parking lot expansion and promenade construction, we must clearly notice this. By Monday preferably this should get noticed. After all, we need to have a quorum at the next meeting in order to take any action.

Future Meetings

- Friday, January 13, 2006
- Friday, February 3, 2006 *Changed from previous
- Friday, Mar 10, 2006
- Friday, Apr 7, 2006 *Subject to change
- Friday, May 12, 2006
- Friday, June 16, 2006 *Subject to change